



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

151, a few verbal changes have been made, and the *Tribunal Praetorium* is described at length (pp. 149-51). The references to the literature of the Forum have also been brought down to date. Professor Huelsen has not changed his views on any of the disputed points in the archaeology of the Forum, but in general he avoids all controversial matter.

To the unqualified commendation that has already been bestowed upon this book nothing need be added here. It is difficult to see how it could be improved—except by more careful proofreading.

S. B. P.

---

*C. Plini Caecili Secundi epistularum libri novem, epistularum ad Traianum liber, panegyricus.* Recensuit R. C. KUKULA. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908.

Müller's text of Pliny's *Letters and Panegyric* is now followed within a lustrum by another in the same series from the hand of Professor Kukula, of the University of Graz, whose work in this field has been known to scholars through a few articles in the *Wiener Studien* and the *Serta Harteliana*, and an annotated edition of selections from the Letters issued in the Teubner series of *Meisterwerke* in 1904. The edition is very welcome, and the material furnished in the *adnotatio critica* at the foot of the pages, though it does not give a complete statement of MS readings, will be found very useful by students of the text.

It is likely to appear strange to American classical scholars that their European colleagues, who have no thousand leagues of dissevering sea between them and the great repositories of MSS, should so frequently be content with no personal search for, and study of, the MSS on which their work finally depends. Doubtless the mere collation of MSS appears an elementary task. It is certainly a wearisome and time-consuming task. But it has been too often left to tyros, and their errors and inefficiencies have tainted the critical work of greater men than themselves, and have infected from the source the whole stream of critical treatment. It might certainly appear unnecessary to affirm that the most fundamental thing of all is to know what the MSS say, and that only after this is determined can we properly proceed to classification, and the inferences that rest upon classification. But the truism evidently needs, like the Ten Commandments said to have been discovered by Mr. Roosevelt, continued and emphasized repetition. Only repeated reviews of others' collations, plus independent extension of effort in the same field, can assure us the proper basis for a critical superstructure. There will still be room enough for conjectural emendation after all this dull work is done. There will also doubtless be room for the coruscations of those who cannot distinguish between what the author probably

did say and what he might have said, or might better have said, or what they imagine they would have said, if they had been in his place.

It is to be regretted in some measure that Professor Kukula is so vague in his statement in the Preface about the degree of his own responsibility for the report of the selected MS readings that he gives. Professor Stangl has furnished him with collations of RFM; but of his own work he says uncertainly, "*Cum superiore anno in Italia commoratus aliquot codices rursum contulisses uel saltem eiusmodi locis inspexisses, quibus de Keili aliorumue censura dubitabam*" (italics by the present writer). The critical reader would like to know definitely—perhaps may be said to have a right to know—to just what readings the editor is producing the testimony of his own eyes, and in just what he is merely reproducing Keil, or somebody else unspecified, because he has himself had no doubt, for one reason or another, that Keil, or the other *quicumque*, was right. We mention this point because of its importance in the entire field of such publication.

Professor Kukula has studiously considered and weighed the published work of all former critics. He agrees with Otto that Keil was wrong in attributing undoubted pre-eminence to MV as truthful representatives of the archetype; but he does believe that MV very frequently (*plerumque*) have preserved the true order of words, while RF more accurately record the words themselves. So in the constitution of his text he attempts to steer a sort of middle course between the claims of these two families. But the principle might cause some perturbation of critical soul. For suppose we grant, as Professor Kukula, following Otto, believes, that the tradition of MV clearly shows the work of some "doctus emendator." Such a considerable revision, made at the time when this revision appears to have been made (though neither Otto nor Kukula suggests a date), must have been made, like other similar revisions, in the interest of a revised scholastic rhetoric. It certainly, therefore, would not confine itself wholly, or even chiefly, to the substitution of one word for another. Sequences of words, clausulae, and the like, would be the points to which its activity would be largely directed. To hold, therefore, that the MV tradition was scholastically revised, as Professor Kukula does hold, and at the same time to hold, as he also does, that in its word-sequence it should be preferred to the RF tradition, which shows no signs of such formal revision, is unreasonable. The word-order of MV must surely have suffered more from the postulated sophistication than has that of RF from the gradual accumulation of sporadic glosses and from accidental misplacements in transcription. Just as the hedgebound school-ma'am prunes the independent tendencies of her pupils' minds and pens into spiritless conformity with the commonplace, so the scholastic reviser worked in that arid bloom of the fifth and sixth centuries. The formally correct, rule-perfect, some-

what jejune order of MV, where it differs from that of RF, is without doubt in large measure the visible result of the postulated scholastic revision. The reviser tried to reduce what appeared to him irregularities, or eccentricities, into conformity with the rules of the school. That is just what the school-ma'am is forever trying to do. It is the point in which the modern critic's mind works like that of his scholastic predecessor.

There seems, therefore, to be a rather shaky foundation for Professor Kukula's *uia media*. Yet of course no reasonable critic would affirm that in every point of similar sort where MV differ from RF, the former are wrong and the latter right. There is at least some sense in the almost rabid pronouncements of a recent English editor of Juvenal *in usum editorum*.

In the lack of personal study of the MSS Professor Kukula has in certain points reproduced Keil to the detriment of his own work. Keil, for example, made no investigation of the class of eight-book MSS, though he rightly determined its existence as a class. But he found it easier to cite the readily accessible D (a patently corrupt text), and certain early printed editions, which were for the most part reproductions, more or less accurate, of the eight-book tradition. Thus he gave an unscientific trend to Plinian criticism which has infected later work. What earthly reason could there be, for example, for citing *in extenso* the *editio princeps*, unless it could be shown that the editor of the *princeps* had access to, and reproduced, a MS or MSS, of undoubted excellence, and of a tradition at present unknown? (Sabbadini's conclusions, on pp. 113, and elsewhere, in his *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese*, might easily lead to false inferences about the present state of the eight-book MSS, as Sabbadini has been in some respects misled by Keil.) The same thing might be said of the Roman edition of Schurener (1474?), except in regard to the eighth book, where it is interesting for its mysterious resurrection of a considerable part of that book, which all the known MSS of the eight-book class lack entirely. The same thing might almost be said of Keil's exaltation of the editions of Pomponius Laetus, Beroaldus, and Catanaeus to such a degree of prominence. Professor Kukula would have done better to leave the following of Keil in these respects, and to substitute for the copying of early editions the copying of the better MSS of the class on which the early editors for the most part depended. Their better readings might well be cited, of course, where they differ from the readings of MSS of the eight-book class now known, though in these instances it is generally impossible to say that they did not depend upon conjectural emendation merely. They certainly did so in more instances than Keil was willing to admit.

In the book of correspondence with Trajan there is no sign that the editor has taken pains to correct the faulty collations of Avantius and Aldus made by Keil, and he has been misled by Hardy in the matter of the report of the Bodleian text, as has, indeed, everybody else up to a recent time (see *Class. Phil.* II, pp. 129-156). The work on the *Panegyric* is naturally of less importance than it would have been before the edition of Baehrens appeared, but it seems to be faithfully and well done, except for the lack of personal study of the MSS.

In the matter of the settlement of questions of text where conjectural emendation must find place, Professor Kukula has been reasonably conservative and self-restrained. As every wise man often enough has reason to do, he has retracted some of his earlier suggestions, and has given others a modest *malim* in the notes instead of putting them into the text. But for the discussion of these individual points, tempting as some of them are, space does not suffice.

While expressing thus much of dissent from the principles and the practice of the editor, we would not fail to recognize that he has given us a good text, and one especially well equipped within its limits for the use of advanced students.

E. T. M.

---

*Philologie et linguistique.* Mélanges offerts à LOUIS HAVET par ses anciens élèves et ses amis à l'occasion du 60<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de sa naissance, le 6 Janvier 1909. Paris: Hachette, 1909. Pp. 624.

The thirty-seven contributors to this complimentary volume are apparently all of the nationality of their friend and teacher, and number among them some of the best-known French classical scholars, and others whose present work augurs fair fame in the future. The subjects treated are more generally in the Latin than in the Greek field, and are well distributed among phonetic, grammatical, and literary themes. Several show pleasing indications of the progress of manuscript studies in France, though none are directly concerned with pure paleographical science, in which Frenchmen ought to excel. Why should not Paris develop a school of paleography to vie with that of Munich, which has been so untimely robbed of its head? The article by R. Cagnat on "La réorganisation de l'Afrique sous Dioclétien" stands on an almost isolated eminence among its companions, not merely because of its quality and the ripe knowledge of its author in the field essayed, but also as being on a historical subject. A good classified index makes the volume easy of consultation on individual points.

E. T. M.